

## **REMARKS**

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 11, 12, 13b, 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner also rejected claim 20 as being of improper dependent form. Lastly, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-13b, 15, 16 and 20 as being obvious over Paulsen in view of Lynch.

The applicant has canceled claims 1-20. Applicant has submitted new claims 21-46. New claims 21-46 are essentially redrafts of claims 1-20 and are done to provide clarity to the previous claims 1-20 only. Claims 21-46 are pending in this application. The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are considered by applicant to overcome each of the Examiner's outstanding rejections. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore requested.

The Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 11, 12, 13b, 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph were due to the lack of antecedent basis for various claim terms. New claims 21-46 correct all of these informalities. The Examiner also rejected claim 20 because claim 20 referred to a system while claim 1 recited a method. New claims 21-46 correct this informality as well.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11, 12, 13b, 15, 16 and 20 as being obvious over Paulsen in view of Lynch. Paulsen describes the creation of a virtual private network by creating a secure tunnel through a public network (the Internet) in order to connect a remote user up to the private network to which it is a member of. By virtue of the fact that the Internet is a public network, the remote user has complete access to all the resources of the Internet. The tunnel is simply a secure connection from the remote user to the private network. There are no additional security concerns regarding the remote user's access to the system in which the tunnel is being created.

This is different from a system wherein the client system is connecting to a private host system in order to connect to a third separate network through a tunnel in the host system. The client system is not a member of the host system nor does it have any right to access any of the resources of the host system. The private host system will have security concerns and would not

want the client system to access its resources. These security concerns are alleviated by the creation of the tunnel under the control of the host system and by restricting access by the client system to that tunnel. The system described in Paulsen does not address this concern as the remote user has free access to the resources of the Internet and consequently does not described the claimed invention of claim 21 where it specifically recites that “said client system does not access any resources of said host system outside of the tunnel.” Independent claim 46 has a similar claim limitation.


The system described in Lynch, likewise does not describe such a system. The system described in Lynch appears to describe an alternate system to the Internet. The meta-network described in Lynch is a routing table and the involves a DHCP server or boarder gateway controller. Lynch appears to be addressing the concern of having a network that is more secure wherein all the computers phone/contact each other and form a meta network on top of the physical network. Again, the system described in Lynch is different from the invention claimed in claim 21 wherein a secure link is established between a client system and a target network through a separate host system wherein the client system’s access to the host system is limited to the tunnel under control by the host system. Independent claim 46 has similar claim limitations. Consequently, claims 21-46 are considered to be allowable over both Paulsen, Lynch and the combination of the two references.

Claims 22-45 all depend from claim 21 and are allowable for the same reason that claim 21 is allowable.

Claims 21-46, the only claims pending in this application, are believed by applicants to define patentable subject matter and should be passed to issue at the earliest possible time. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration and prompt notice to that affect are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

August 10, 2005  
SC:dw  
(212) 521-5400

By:   
Stephen M. Chin, Reg. No. 39,938  
Reed Smith LLP  
599 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10022-7650